



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/025,928	12/26/2001	Mamoru Uchida	35.C16066	7419

5514 7590 08/13/2004

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

LEE, PATRICK J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2878

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

A

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/025,928	Applicant(s) UCHIDA, MAMORU	
	Examiner Patrick J. Lee	Art Unit 2878	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 June 2004.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-26 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☒ Claim(s) 18-26 is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-17 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>0604</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to request for continued examination filed June 7th, 2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3, 7, 10-11, & 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakagawa et al JP61028240.

Nakagawa et al disclose a signal transmitting system comprising optical guide plate (200), light emitting element (310), and light detecting element (410).

With respect to claims 1 & 10-11, Nakagawa et al disclose a light emitting element (310) and light detecting element (410) as a light receiving part embedded within optical guide plate (200) as an two-dimensional optical waveguide layer capable of propagating a light signal in a plurality of directions.

With respect to claim 2, Nakagawa et al disclose a board (A100, B100) as electric wiring layers stacked on the optical waveguide layer (200).

With respect to claim 3, Nakagawa et al discloses the light receiving part (410) as being embedded to directly receive the light signal propagating through the two-dimensional waveguide layer (200).

With respect to claim 7, Nakagawa et al disclose the light-emitting element (310) to be embedded in optical guide plate (200).

With respect to claim 13, Nakagawa et al disclose electric board (A100) to couple with light receiving part (410).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 5-6, 9, 12, & 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa et al JP61028240.

Nakagawa et al disclose the device as described in the discussion of claims 1-3, 7, 10-11, & 13.

With respect to claims 5-6, 9, 12, & 14-16, Nakagawa et al do not explicitly disclose a spherical surface for the light receiving device, but such would have been a mere matter of obvious design choice in order to ensure the ability of the light receiving part to receive light from multiple directions.

With respect to claim 8, Nakagawa et al do not explicitly disclose a second electrical wiring layer, but such would have been obvious to modify the teachings of Nakagawa et al accordingly in order to send the electrical signal to an additional device to allow for additional processing.

With respect to claim 17, the use of flexible substrates is not explicitly disclosed but would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill, as it would allow the device to be utilized in a plurality of spatial situations.

Double Patenting

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claims 1-3, 7, & 10-11 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-2, 5, 7, & 17-20 of copending Application No. 10/137,350. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: Claims 1-2, 5, 7, & 17-20 of the copending application and claims 1-3, 7, & 10-11 of the instant application both disclose an optical circuit comprising optical devices and an optical light guiding layer

transmitting light in a plurality of directions, in which the light receiving and light emitting devices are embedded or implanted into the optical light guiding layer. The copending application does distinguish itself from the instant application in claims 8 & 11-16 by disclosing an anodized alumina substrate.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 18-26 are allowable over the prior art.

9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

With respect to claims 18 & 25, the prior art of record does not disclose nor suggest the use of a spherical semiconductor substrate to integrate the electronic and optical device. As a result, independent claims 18 & 25 and dependent claims 19-24 & 26 are allowable over the prior art.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick J. Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-2440. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David P. Porta can be reached on (571) 272-2444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patrick J. Lee
Examiner
Art Unit 2878

PJL
August 2nd, 2004



Stephone B. Allen
Primary Examiner